## 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 9 AT TACOMA 10 11 ABDULLAH MUJAHID FKA JACK LECK, CASE NO. C09-5601 FDB/JRC 12 Plaintiff, ORDER TO FILE AN AMENDED 13 COMPLAINT AND PROVIDE v. SERVICE DOCUMENTS 14 KATHY HARRIS et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge 18 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636 (b) (1) (A) and 636 (b) (1) (B) and Local Magistrates Judges' Rules 19 MJR 1, MJR 3, and MJR 4. Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. 20 Plaintiff seeks monetary damages a result of alleged denials of his religious rights. The 21 22 complaint is deficient for a number of reasons. 23 In order to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a complaint must allege that (1) the 24 conduct complained of was committed by a person acting under color of state law and that (2) 25 the conduct deprived a person of a right, privilege, or immunity secured by the Constitution or

laws of the United States. Parratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527, 535 (1981), overruled on other

26

grounds, Daniels v. Williams, 474 U.S. 327 (1986). Section 1983 is the appropriate avenue to remedy an alleged wrong only if both of these elements are present. Haygood v. Younger, 769 F.2d 1350, 1354 (9th Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 478 U.S. 1020 (1986). In addition, plaintiff must allege facts showing how individually named defendants caused or personally participated in causing the harm alleged in the complaint. Arnold v. IBM, 637 F.2d 1350, 1355 (9th Cir. 1981). A defendant cannot be held liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 solely on the basis of supervisory responsibility or position. Monell v. New York City Dept. of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 694 n.58 (1978). A theory of *respondeat superior* is not sufficient to state a § 1983 claim. Padway v. Palches, 665 F.2d 965 (9th Cir. 1982). The complaint in this action does not set forth any facts showing what actions were taken by which defendants.

Plaintiff is ordered to file an amended complaint. The document should be titled "first amended complaint." The first amended complaint will act as a complete substitute for the original and not as a supplement. For each named defendant plaintiff should submit a service copy of the complaint and a filled out Marshal's service form. The amended complaint will be due on or before December 11, 2009. Failure to comply with this order may result in a Report and Recommendation that this action be dismissed.

The clerk's office is directed to send plaintiff a copy of this order and note the December 11, 2009, date on the court's calendar.

DATED this  $3^{rd}$  day of November, 2009.

J. Richard Creatura

United States Magistrate Judge